

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,793	10/27/2000	Bruce D. Melick	P04254US1	6695
22885	7590 11/25/2003		EXAMINER	
•	ORHEES & SEASE,	HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G		
801 GRAND AVENUE SUITE 3200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DES MOINES	s, IA 50309-2721	•	2172	10
			DATE MAILED: 11/25/2003	, 10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

32				6			
Advisory Action		Application No.	Applicant(s)	OC			
		09/698,793	MELICK ET AL.	_			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Monplaisir G Hamilton	2172				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
Therefo final rej conditio	EPLY FILED 11 November 2003 FAILS TO PLAC ore, further action by the applicant is required to a ection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 on for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea ation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ition in			
	PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
fee have fee unde (2) as set	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing dat The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Insight may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (contents)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejecting HE FINAL REJECTION.  R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriation of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or			
	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Torral Transfer (37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
	he proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b						
(a)	they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d)	they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	IS.			
	NOTE:						
3. 🗌 A	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	etion(s):					
	lewly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
	The a)  affidavit, b)  exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		idered but does NO	T place the			
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly			
	for purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
Т	he status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
(	Claim(s) allowed:						
	Claim(s) objected to:						
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20 and 35-47</u> .						
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. 🗌 1	he drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. <u> </u>	lote the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:							
_ <b>_</b>							



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has essentially argued that the claimed structured linear database is not equivalent to the data structure disclosed by Jungers. Examiner understands that the claimed linear database is used to interpert the ultrawide transport stream. Examiner holds the the directory information stored in the data structure used by Jungers is also used to interpret a transport steam (col 4, lines 25-30). Examiner does not see any patentable difference in the way the these streams are processed.

KIM VU

PATENT EXAMINER